

THE COURT

THE COURT

COURT OF OVEN AND TERMINER

Before Judge Ingraham.
There was a brief session of this Court yesterday with cases tried of no special public interest.
John McGrath was convicted of burglary and sentenced five years to State Prison.

Ann McCormick was found guilty of petit larceny and sentenced to the Penitentiary for six months.

Conrad Welch was brought in guilty of grand larceny and sentenced to the Penitentiary for two years and six months.

Reuben Ward, on conviction of burglary and larceny, was sentenced to the Penitentiary for two years and six months.

John Meyers was convicted of grand larceny and sentenced to the Penitentiary for two years and six months.

Decisions.
Day vs. Day et al.—Motion denied, with leave to renew.
Riddle vs. Sanford.—Memoranda for counsel.
Close et al. vs. Smith et al.—Motion denied.
Appleton vs. Appleton.—Order settled.

Carter vs. Kain.—Memoranda for counsel.
Griswold et al. vs. McNally.—Motion denied.
McNamara vs. The Walkill National
granted.
Johnson vs. Harland.—Memoranda for counsel.
Punsh vs. Sleman et al.—Motion denied.
Silberberg vs. Schwartz et al.—Motion granted.

In the Matter of the Guardianship of *Mal*
al.—Same.
Delavan vs. Brown, et al.—Memoranda.
Wright vs. The Great Western Insuran
Same.
Carrington vs. Ward et al.—Motion denied.
The Union Dime Savings Institution vs.
Order. I do not think the order should be

By Judge Brady.
Depew vs. Dewey.—Order settled.
Bircell et al. vs. Miller.—Findings settled.
Hutterworth vs. Rothenberg et al.—Order
Livingston et al. vs. White et al.—Same.

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM
Adjournment for the Term
The Trial Terms, parts 1 and 2, of this Court

and then, after hearing some unimportant motions till the 8th of January, 1872. An order was effect by Mr. Meeks, Deputy Clerk of the Court, summonsed for Monday, January 1, day on the second Monday of the month.

Decisions.
By Judge Jones.
Hall vs. Blackburn.—Judgment for plaintiff.
Bryce vs. Lorillard Insurance Company.
defendant, with costs.

Christopher vs. McCanis.—Findings filed directed to be entered.
Clark vs. Ennis.—Findings filed. Extra allowance allowed on motion. Judgment must be entered.
Johnson vs. Crump.—Findings filed.
Pelton vs. Bulkley.—Judgment for plaintiff with costs.

McNally vs. Hennuke.—Judgment for plaintiff.
Findings settled.
Bouton vs. Bogert.—See opinion.
Haldwin vs. Martin.—Memoranda for court.
ment of case.
Bagley vs. Canon.—Motion for new trial denied.
Grant vs. Barr.—Judgment for plaintiff, with costs.

Anthony vs. Atkinson.—Findings filed directed to be entered.
Cochey vs. Hurd.—Motion granted in part, and denied in part.
Fitch vs. Fitch.—Motion dismissed with leave to renew if the party be so advised.

Special Notice.
Judge Jones will be in attendance next Saturday for the adjournment of the General Term, to sign and judgments in cases decided by him.

THE COURT

COURT OF OVER AND TERMINER

Convictions and Sentence

Before Judge Ingraham.

There was a brief session of this Court yet cases tried of no special public interest.

John R. O'Leary—Convicted of burglary sentenced five years to State Prison.

Ann McCormick was found guilty of petit larceny sentenced to the County Jail for six months.

Conrad Welch was brought in guilty of grand larceny ordered at hard labor in State Prison for two years.

Edward C. O'Connell—Conviction of burglary same sentence.

John Barker was convicted of grand larceny to two years and six months to State Prison.

Fidelsions.

Day vs. Day et al.—Motion denied, with leave to reargue.

Riddle vs. Sanford—Memoranda for counsel.

Johnson vs. Johnson et al.—Motion denied.

Appleton vs. Appleton—Order settled.

Carter vs. Kane—Memoranda for counsel.

Swanwick vs. Swanwick et al.—Motion granted.

McNamara vs. The Walker National Bank—Motion granted.

Johnson vs. Harland—Memoranda for counsel.

French vs. Slemmon et al.—Motion denied.

Shirley vs. Schwartz et al.—Motion granted.

In the Matter of the Guardianship of Miss L. S. Kane—

Delavan vs. Brown, et al.—Memoranda.

Wright vs. Time—Order settled.

Samra—

Carrington vs. Ward et al.—Motion denied.

Wright vs. Ward et al.—Motion denied.

O'Leary—I do not think the order should be set aside.

Final day. By Judge Brady.

Dawson vs. Dewey—Order settled.

Wright vs. Miller—Order settled.

Wright vs. Rothberg et al.—Order settled.

Livingston et al. vs. The City of New York—

SUPREME COURT—TRIAL TERM.

Adjournment for the Term.

The Trial Terms, parts 1 and 3, of this Court.

and then, after hearing some unimportant matters till the 8th of January, 1872. An order was

Hall vs. Blackhurst.—Judgment for plaintiff.
 Bryce vs. Lordland Insurance Company.
 Christopher vs. McDaniel.—Findings filed.
 directed to be entered.
 Clark vs. Ezan.—Findings filed. Extra allow-
 ed on motion.—Judgment must be
 allowed on motion.—Judgment must be
 Johnson vs. Crump.—Findings filed.
 Peterson vs. Bukley.—Judgment for plain-
 tiff with costs.
 McNally vs. Hennuke.—Judgment for plain-
 tiff with costs.
 Findings sent.
 Bonita vs. Bogert.—See opinion.
 Baldwin vs. Marlin.—Memoranda for com-

Bagley vs. Canon—Motion for new trial denied.
Grant vs. Barr.—Judgment for plaintiff, with costs.

Anthony vs. Atkinson.—Findings made
 directed to be entered.
 Cochey vs. Hurd.—Motion granted in part,
 and denied in part.
 Fitch vs. —.—Motion dismissed with
 leave to renew if the party be advised.
 White vs. Talmadge.—Case order to be filed.
 Talmadge vs. White.—Same.

Special Notes.
 Judge Jones will be attendance next Sa-
 turday morning at the general term, to sign
 and judgments in cases decided by him.

COMMON PLEAS—Special Term.

Decisions.
 By Judge Lawrence.
 Goldstein vs. Marx.—Motion denied.
 Koehling vs. Arlington et al.—Motion grant-
 ed, costs and acceptance of short notes of tr-
 ade. Kaufman, Saccaro, Green.

Beebe et al. vs. Mittenacht.—Application for
denied, without costs.

SACKEIT vs. NIOKKA.—Application for
junction granted.

CARROLL vs. KENNEY, et al.—Default opened
costs of motion.

STRONG vs. BLACK.—Stay modified so as to
proceed with examination of witnesses.

COLE vs. BURNHAM.—Reference ordered.

DOLAN vs. BURNHAM.—Order for further re-
cause.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Before Judge Bedford.

The CHY Judge came into Court yesterday.
Jury not having any official communication.
Court adjourned until to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.—Held by J.
N. HARRIS, Chief Justice, at 10 A.M., at the
County Jail, San Francisco.

SUPERIOR COURT.—Parts 1 and 2.—Adj.

COUNTS & FEITING

The Trial of J. D. Miner, the Attorneyfeiter—Summing Up of Counsel Defence.

Yesterday the trial of J. D. Miner, the feiter, was resumed in the United States before Judge Benedict. As it was understood sitting of the Court the summing up of counsel would be entered upon, the court room Mr. Pierpont, Mr. Purdy and Mr. De Ko

case for the prosecution on behalf of the
Mr. Fullerton, Mr. B. K. Phelps and Mr. C.

case for the prosecution on behalf of the
Mr. Fullerton, Mr. H. K. Phelps and Mr. C.
were counsel for the defendant, Miner.
At eleven o'clock, or shortly after, the
exception of the foreman, Mr. Sinclair Tousey
place. Mr. Tousey did not make his a
twenty man tries to twelve o'clock, when he
conception on his part as to the day to wha
was adjourned from the last session.
factory, and stated that as the summing up
to commence he would suggest to con
to commence he would suggest to con
any correction in regard to stating
dance could be made when counsel had finish
This would be the better course and would p
also.

**MR. FULLERTON'S SPEECH FOR THE
A**
At a quarter to twelve o'clock Mr. William
to Counsel for the defendant, Mr. Fullerton
in this country under our h
of criminal law no man could
criminal justice be made.

Although he did not believe his client was deserving of the death penalty, he believed in the verity of the law and the existence of such a do-

[illegible]

cannot acquit my client at once. If there be doubt of his guilt the Court will instruct you you have taken and which will press upon

cannot acquit my client at once. If there be doubt of his guilt the Court will instruct you to retire to consider your verdict, you are bound to do so. I am anxious to deliver this man from the prison, and I am convinced that you will acquit him. I have returned into evidence of guilt. I am authorized by my power to convince you of his innocence you may acquit, and acquit at once. At the same time I am anxious to see that the man who taught us to love one another, and that of man is to love his neighbor as himself—man is not to be put to death. I am authorized in the light of the evidence, to acquit, restore this man to the position as once of a free man, and to the place of his home. I am a wife or child to spring to his embrace, closed over them, yet it is his home, around which he has gathered his family, and he has come back to thank's good Providence and a jury men that they have delivered him from the wicked and designing men have raised around him, and I am authorized to deliver him from power, and concluded his address at 2 o'clock.

government.

THE BROADWAY WIDENING

Looking After the Bills—The Ways of the Taxation of the Bill of Expense, &c., to be Submitted to a Bill of Costs, Charges and Expenses.

The bill of costs, charges and expenses is presented by the Commissioners of Estimate and Assessment yesterday presented for taxation to Judge of the Supreme Court.

Corporation Counsel O'Gorman stated that the taxation was duly published in the newspapers and appointed in the notice no objection offered; that the claims for services therein were all paid, and that he had no reason to believe that there was proper bill been made; but that he would submit all bills of costs to such cases should be examined in detail by the Court, or if the Court so ordered.

tion to the investigation, that a referee be appointed by the board, as provided for by statute.

the Court, in response to the application, held that the statute was unconstitutional. The Court said that the statute was unconstitutional because it was a bill of attainder and ex post facto law. The Court also said that the statute was unconstitutional because it was a bill of attainder and ex post facto law.